

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 17-25 and 27-40 are pending in the present application, claim 26 having been cancelled herein. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The objection to the specification was maintained due to the absence of the heading "Brief Description of the Drawings". A heading has been inserted in the specification in accordance with the Examiner's requirement. Withdrawal of the objection is most respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of the various rejections in the prior Office Action has been withdrawn.

Claims 27, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As Applicant understands the rejection, it is based on the recitation of claim 26, from which claims 27, 31 and 33 depend, that the substrate is required to support the electrodes. Applicant has cancelled claim 26 and amended claims 27, 31 and 33 to be dependent upon claim 17. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment overcomes the rejection since claim 17 does not recite that

the substrate is required to support the electrodes.

Withdrawal of the rejection is most respectfully requested.

Claims 26-40 were rejected in a number of prior art rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103. Applicant respectfully submits that all of these rejections are rendered moot by the canceling of claim 26 and the amendments of claims 27-40 to depend from allowed claim 17.


Applicant wishes to clarify statements made in the prior amendment filed on October 17, 2003, regarding the nature of claim 26. In particular, Applicant previously stated that new claim 26 replaces claim 16 and is believed to constitute the essence of claim 16. Upon reflection, Applicant notes that new claim 26 corresponded to a combination of claim 1 and the allowed claim 17 with at least one difference in that allowed claim 17 recited at least two electroluminescent organic semi-conductor layers. Further, on page 14, second paragraph, Applicant stated that claim 1 incorporated the important features of claims 16 and 17. This was an inadvertent error. As noted in the previously in the amendment on page 13 paragraph d, amended claim 1 incorporated the subject matter of deleted claim 16. In addition, Applicant's representative agrees with the comments of the Examiner that claim 26 did not recite an insulated part of the substrate.

Appln. No. 10/048,017  
Amd. dated February 17, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of December 16, 2003

In view of the above amendments and remarks,  
Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal  
of the outstanding rejections record. Applicants submit that  
the application is in condition for allowance and early notice  
to this effect is most earnestly solicited. If the Examiner  
has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at  
202-628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By   
Ronni S. Jillions  
Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:ft  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\G\geve\Magain1\PTO\16March04Amendment.doc